

METRIC CHARACTERIZATIONS OF ISOMETRIES AND OF UNITAL OPERATOR SPACES AND SYSTEMS

DAVID P. BLECHER AND MATTHEW NEAL

ABSTRACT. We give some new characterizations of unitaries, isometries, unital operator spaces, unital function spaces, operator systems, C^* -algebras, and related objects. These characterizations only employ the vector space and operator space structure.

1. INTRODUCTION

We give some new characterizations, of unitaries, isometries, unital operator spaces, unital function spaces, operator systems, C^* -algebras, and related objects. Several characterizations of these objects are already known; see e.g. [15, Theorem 9.5.16], [1], the discussion on p. 316 of [4], [14], and [13]. One difference between our paper and these cited references, is that our results only use the vector space structure of the space and its matrix norms, in the spirit of Ruan's matrix norm characterization of operator spaces [18], whereas the other cited references use criteria involving maps or functionals on the space. Our first main result characterizes unital operator spaces, that is, subspaces of a unital C^* -algebra containing the identity. More abstractly, a unital operator space is a pair (X, u) consisting of an operator space X containing a fixed element u such that there exists a Hilbert space H and a complete isometry $T : X \rightarrow B(H)$ with $T(u) = I_H$. Such spaces have played a significant role since the birth of operator space theory in [2]. Indeed, although the latter paper is mostly concerned with unital operator algebras, it was remarked in several places there that many of the results are valid for unital operator spaces. The text [6] also greatly emphasizes unital operator spaces. The abstract characterization of these objects has been missing until recently, and we had wondered about this over the years; the following is our answer to this question. Our result complements Ruan's characterization of operator spaces [18], the Blecher-Ruan-Sinclair abstract characterization of operator algebras [8], and a host of other theorems of this type (see e.g. [6, 16]). To state it, we will write u_n for the diagonal matrix in $M_n(X)$ with u in each diagonal entry.

Theorem 1.1. *If u is an element in an operator space X , then (X, u) is a unital operator space if and only if*

$$\|[u_n \ x]\| = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} u_n \\ x \end{bmatrix} \right\| = \sqrt{2},$$

for all $x \in M_n(X)$ of norm 1, and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Date: May 13, 2008. Revision of May 22, 2008.

*Blecher was partially supported by grant DMS 0800674 from the National Science Foundation. Neal was supported by Denison University.

We call the element u in the last theorem a *unitary in X* , or a *unit* or *identity* for X . We also find the matching abstract characterization of function spaces containing constants. Namely a pair (X, g) , where X is now a Banach space, is a unital function space iff $\sup\{\|sf + tg\| : s, t \in \mathbb{C}, |s|^2 + |t|^2 = 1\} = \sqrt{2}$ for every $f \in X$ with $\|f\| = 1$. This is presented in Section 5. In section 2 of our paper we also characterize unitaries and isometries in a C^* -algebra, etc. In Section 3 we characterize and study operator systems, that is selfadjoint subspaces of a unital C^* -algebra containing the identity. More abstractly, an operator system is a unital operator space (X, u) for which there exists a linear complete isometry $T : X \rightarrow B(H)$ with $T(u) = I_H$ and $T(X)$ selfadjoint. Theorem 1.1 leads to new intrinsic characterizations of operator systems. For example:

Theorem 1.2. *A unital operator space (X, u) (characterized above) is an operator system iff for all $x \in \text{Ball}(X)$ there exists an element $y \in \text{Ball}(X)$ with*

$$\left\| \begin{bmatrix} tu & x \\ y & tu \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq \sqrt{t^2 + 1} \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R}. \text{ It is also equivalent to:}$$

$$\inf \left\{ \left\| \begin{bmatrix} tu & x \\ y & tu \end{bmatrix} \right\| : y \in \text{Ball}(X) \right\} \leq \sqrt{t^2 + 1}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \text{Ball}(X)$.

Similarly, we obtain new ‘matrix norm’ characterizations of C^* -algebras. For example:

Theorem 1.3. *A unital operator space $(X, 1)$ (characterized above) possesses a product with respect to which it is isomorphic to a C^* -algebra via a unital complete isometry, if and only if X is spanned by the unitaries in X (characterized in Section 2) and for every unitary v in X we have*

$$\inf \left\{ \left\| \begin{bmatrix} t1 & y \\ z & tv \end{bmatrix} \right\| : z \in \text{Ball}(X) \right\} \leq \sqrt{t^2 + 1}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y \in \text{Ball}(X)$.

Section 4 discusses changing the identity in an operator system; also we mention a connection between our theory and the famous characterization due to Choi and Effros of operator systems, in terms of an order unit [10, 16].

We now turn to precise definitions and notation. Any unexplained terms below can be found in [6], or any of the other recent books on operator spaces. All vector spaces are over the complex field $\mathbb{C}$. The letters H, K are usually reserved for Hilbert spaces. A given cone in a space X will sometimes be written as X_+ , and $X_{\text{sa}} = \{x \in X : x = x^*\}$ assuming that there is an involution $*$ around. All normed (or operator) spaces are assumed to be complete. A (resp. complete) *order isomorphism* is a (resp. completely) positive linear bijection T such that T^{-1} is (resp. completely) positive. It is well known that a surjective complete isometry T between operator systems with $T(1) = 1$ is a complete order isomorphism (see e.g. 1.3.3 in [6]). Thus we will not be too concerned with positivity issues in this paper.

A *TRO* (ternary ring of operators) is a closed subspace Z of a C^* -algebra, or of $B(K, H)$, such that $ZZ^*Z \subset Z$. We refer to e.g. [12, 6] for the basic theory of TROs. A *ternary morphism* on a TRO Z is a linear map T such that $T(xy^*z) = T(x)T(y)^*T(z)$ for all $x, y, z \in Z$. We write ZZ^* for the closure of the linear span of products zw^* with $z, w \in Z$, and similarly for Z^*Z . These are C^* -algebras. The

ternary envelope of an operator space X is a pair $(\mathcal{T}(X), j)$ consisting of a TRO $\mathcal{T}(X)$ and a completely isometric linear map $j : X \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(X)$, such that $\mathcal{T}(X)$ is generated by $j(X)$ as a TRO (that is, there is no closed subTRO containing $j(X)$), and which has the following property: given any completely isometric linear map i from X into a TRO Z which is generated by $i(X)$, there exists a (necessarily unique and surjective) ternary morphism $\theta : Z \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(X)$ such that $\theta \circ i = j$. If (X, u) is a unital operator space then the ternary envelope may be taken to be the C^* -envelope of e.g. [6, Section 4.3]; this is a C^* -algebra $C_e^*(X)$ with identity u . If X is an operator system then X is a selfadjoint subspace of $C_e^*(X)$.

We remark that the criteria appearing in the characterizations in [13] have nothing in common with those in our results, nor do the methods of proof. For example, their criteria for unital operator spaces or systems are in terms of completely contractive unital matrix valued maps φ on the space, and they rely on there being ‘sufficiently many’ of such maps.

2. CHARACTERIZATION OF ISOMETRIES AND UNITAL SPACES

Clearly, the definition of a unital operator space (X, u) above is unchanged if we replace $B(H)$ by a unital C^* -algebra, or if we replace I_H with any unitary. Thus the element u is called a unitary in X . Similarly, we say that an element v in an operator space X is an *isometry* (resp. *coisometry*) in X if there exists a complete isometry T from X into $B(K, H)$, for Hilbert spaces H and K , with $T(v)$ an isometry (resp. coisometry).

A *unitary* in a TRO Z is an element $u \in Z$ with $uu^*z = z$ and $zu^*u = z$ for all $z \in Z$. We say that u is an *coisometry* (resp. *isometry*) if just the first (resp. second) condition holds. If Z is a C^* -algebra it is easy to see that these coincide with the usual definition of unitary, coisometry, and isometry. We will soon see that these also coincide with the operator space definitions above.

Theorem 2.1. *An element u in a C^* -algebra or TRO A is a unitary if and only if $\|[u \ x]\|^2 = 1 + \|x\|^2$ and $\|[u \ x]^t\|^2 = 1 + \|x\|^2$, for all $x \in A$. Indeed, it suffices to consider norm one elements x here. Similarly, u is a coisometry (resp. isometry) iff the first (resp. second) of these norm conditions holds for all $x \in A$.*

Proof. We just prove the coisometry assertion, the others following by symmetry. By the C^* -identity, $\|[u \ x]\|^2 = \|uu^* + xx^*\|$. If u is a coisometry then this equals $1 + \|x\|^2$. Conversely, suppose that $\|[u \ x]\|^2 = 2$ for all $x \in A$ of norm 1. It is easy to see that this implies $\|u\| = 1$. By the C^* -identity, the norm of the matrix with entries u^*u, u^*x, x^*u, x^*x , is also 2. By writing this matrix as a diagonal matrix plus another matrix, the last norm is $\leq \max\{\|u^*u\|, \|x^*x\|\} + \|u^*x\| = 1 + \|u^*x\| \leq 2$. Hence $\|u^*x\| = 1$. That $uu^*x = x$ can be deduced now from the well known functional calculus in JB^* -triples (see e.g. p. 238 in [7] for an exposition of the TRO case of this), which shows that u is a partial isometry, hence $\|uu^*x - x\| = 0$. Instead we will use some well known and elementary facts from C^* -module theory. By the above, the operator L_{u^*} of left multiplication by u^* is an isometric right module map from A onto the closed right ideal (submodule) u^*A of A^*A . However every isometric C^* -module map is ‘unitary’ (see e.g. [6, Corollary 8.1.8]). That is, in C^* -module language,

$$\langle uu^*x, x \rangle = \langle u^*x, u^*x \rangle = \langle x, x \rangle = x^*x, \quad x \in A.$$

Since $uu^* \leq 1$, it follows easily that $\|(1 - uu^*)x\|^2 = 0$ as desired. $\square$

Lemma 2.2. *Let u be an element in an operator space X . The following are equivalent:*

- (i) *u is a unitary (resp. isometry, coisometry) in X .*
- (ii) *There exists a TRO Z containing X completely isometrically, such that u is a unitary (resp. isometry, coisometry) in Z .*
- (iii) *The image of u in the ternary envelope $\mathcal{T}(X)$ is a unitary (resp. isometry, coisometry).*

Proof. We focus mainly the coisometry case, the others usually being similar. That (iii) implies (ii) is obvious.

(i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) If $v = T(u)$ is a coisometry for a complete isometry $T : X \rightarrow B(K, H)$, then v is a coisometry in the TRO Z generated by $T(X)$ in $B(K, H)$.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) We may assume that Z is generated by X , and then this follows by the universal property of $\mathcal{T}(X)$.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) If u is a coisometry in Z then uu^* is the identity of the C^* -algebra ZZ^* . If we represent the ‘linking algebra’ of Z nondegenerately on a Hilbert space $H \oplus K$ in the usual way (see e.g. 8.2.22 in [6]), then $uu^* = I_H$, so that u is a coisometry from K to H .

Note that if u is a unitary in $Z = \mathcal{T}(X)$, then u^*Z is a C^* -algebra with identity u , and $Tx = u^*x$ is a ‘unital complete isometry’. $\square$

One may also phrase (iii) above in terms of the injective envelope $I(X)$.

We recall u_n is the diagonal matrix in $M_n(X)$ with u in every diagonal entry.

Theorem 2.3. *An element u in an operator space X is a unitary in X if and only if $\|[u_n \ x]\|^2 = 1 + \|x\|^2$ and $\|[u_n \ x]^t\|^2 = 1 + \|x\|^2$, for all $x \in M_n(X)$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, it suffices to consider norm one matrices x here. Similarly, u is a coisometry (resp. isometry) in X iff the first (resp. second) of these norm conditions holds for all $x \in M_n(X)$.*

Proof. We just prove the coisometry assertion, the others following by symmetry. The ‘easy direction’ is just as in Theorem 2.1. Conversely, given the $\|[u_n \ x]\|^2 = 1 + \|x\|^2$ condition, we consider $X \subset Z = \mathcal{T}(X)$. As in the proof of Theorem 2.1 we obtain $\|u^*x\| = \|x\|$, for all $x \in X$. This is equivalent to $\|uu^*x\| = \|x\|$ for every $x \in X$. Indeed if $\|u^*x\| = 1$ for x of norm 1, then $1 \geq \|uu^*x\| \geq \|x^*uu^*x\| = 1$ by the C^* -identity. Thus, the operator $L : \mathcal{T}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(X)$ of left multiplication by uu^* is an isometry on X . Similarly, it is a complete isometry on X . Thus by the ‘essential’ property of the ternary envelope (see e.g. [12] or [6, 8.3.12 (3) and 4.3.6]), L is an isometry on $\mathcal{T}(X)$. By the proof of Theorem 2.1, u is a coisometry in $\mathcal{T}(X)$. By Lemma 2.2, u is a coisometry in X . $\square$

Remark. Notice that in a selfadjoint operator space, if $u = u^*$ then the one condition $\|[u \ x]\|^2 = 1 + \|x\|^2$ in the characterization of unitaries above is equivalent to the other condition $\|[u \ x]^t\|^2 = 1 + \|x\|^2$, and similarly for the matricial version of these equalities.

3. OPERATOR SYSTEMS

It is explained in 1.3.7 of [6] (relying on results from [2]), that every unital operator space (X, u) contains a canonical operator system $\Delta(X)$. Since this system depends (only) on the unit u , we will write it as Δ^u . If X is represented as a subspace of $B(H)$ via a complete isometry T taking u to I_H , then $\Delta^u = X \cap X^*$,

the latter involution and intersection taken in $B(H)$. However the important point for us is that as a subspace of X , Δ^u does not depend on the particular H or T . Nor does its positive cone, which will be written as Δ_+^u , nor does its involution; these depend only on the unit u . We now mention a recipe for describing these elements more explicitly in terms of the norm and linear structure of X .

Definition 3.1. Let u, x be elements of a Banach space X . We say that x is *u-hermitian* if there is a constant K such that $\|u + itx\|^2 \leq 1 + Kt^2$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. We say that x is *u-positive* if it is *u-hermitian*, and if $\|x\|u - x \leq \|x\|$.

It is well known (and is an easy exercise) in the theory of numerical ranges in Banach algebras, that an element x in a C^* -algebra with identity u , is selfadjoint iff it is *u-hermitian*, and indeed in this case $\|u + itx\|^2 = 1 + t^2\|x\|^2$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. If the reader prefers they may take the latter as the definition of *u-hermitian* in what follows. We remark that the given definition has the advantage that any contractive operator T on X takes *u-hermitians* to $T(u)$ -hermitians, and takes *u-positives* in $\text{Ball}(X)$ to $T(u)$ -positive elements. Indeed the *u-positives* in $\text{Ball}(X)$ are the *u-hermitians* with $\|u - x\| \leq 1$.

Proposition 3.2. *If (X, u) is a unital operator space then Δ^u is the span of the u-hermitians in X , and Δ_{sa}^u is the set of u-hermitians in X , and Δ_+^u is the set of u-positives in X . Moreover we have the following matricial characterization of Δ_{sa}^u and Δ_+^u : if $x \in \text{Ball}(X)$ then $x \in \Delta_{sa}^u$ iff $\left\| \begin{bmatrix} tu & x \\ -x & tu \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq \sqrt{t^2 + 1}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$; also $x \in \Delta_+^u$ iff $\left\| \begin{bmatrix} tu & u - x \\ x - u & tu \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq \sqrt{t^2 + 1}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Only the last two ‘iff’s need proof. The first of these is a special case of Lemma 3.6 below. For the second note that the norm condition implies that $x - u \in \text{Ball}(X)$, and then the first ‘iff’ implies $x \in \Delta_{sa}^u$, so that x is *u-positive*. $\square$

Of course the involution on Δ^u is just $(h + ik)^* = h - ik$, if $h, k \in \Delta_{sa}^u$.

Corollary 3.3. *A unital operator space (X, u) is an operator system iff the u-hermitians span X , and iff the u-positives span X .*

Remark. We can obviously replace the spans in the last result by linear combinations of two or four elements respectively. So, a unital operator space (X, u) is an operator system iff for every $x \in X$ there exists a $y \in X$ with $x + y$ and $i(x - y)$ *u-hermitian*.

Corollary 3.4. *Let (X, u) be a unital operator space which also possesses a conjugate linear involution $*$. Then (X, u) is an operator system whose involution is $*$ if and only if $x = x^* \in X$ implies that x is u-hermitian.*

Proof. Suppose that $x = x^*$ implies that x is *u-hermitian*. Since the set of elements with $x = x^*$ spans X , so does the set of *u-hermitians*. Thus X is an operator system. The rest is obvious. $\square$

Remark. The conditions in the last corollary are also equivalent to the matricial condition $\left\| \begin{bmatrix} tu & x \\ -x^* & tu \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq \sqrt{t^2 + 1}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. This follows from the next proof, or from Lemma 3.6 below.

We now prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof. (Of **Theorem 1.2**) If $I_H \in X = X^* \subset B(H)$ then by the C^* -identity it is easy to see that $\left\| \begin{bmatrix} tI & x \\ -x^* & tI \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2 = t^2 + 1$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in X$ with $\|x\| = 1$. Conversely, if $I_H \in X \subset B(H)$ and if the condition in Theorem 1.2 involving the infimum holds, then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is an element $y_n \in X$ with $\left\| \begin{bmatrix} nI & x \\ y_n & nI \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2 \leq n^2 + 1 + \frac{1}{n}$. The norm of the last matrix is the unchanged if we multiply the ‘diagonal entries’ by -1 . Using the C^* -identity it follows that for every state φ on $M_2(B(H))$ we have

$$n^2 + \varphi\left(\begin{bmatrix} xx^* & 0 \\ 0 & y_n y_n^* \end{bmatrix}\right) \pm n\varphi\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & x + y_n^* \\ y_n + x^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) \leq n^2 + 1 + \frac{1}{n}.$$

Taking the supremum over all states φ , we deduce that

$$\|y_n + x^*\| = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x + y_n^* \\ y_n + x^* & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n^2}.$$

Hence $y_n \rightarrow -x^*$, and so $X^* = X$. $\square$

Remark. In Theorem 1.2 it does not suffice to take $t = 1$, even in the case that $\|x\| = 1$. Indeed it is easy to argue that any nonselfadjoint unital function space will be a counterexample to this.

We can use the ideas above to characterize C^* -algebras among the operator systems or unital operator spaces. We will write the identity u of our operator system X as 1 . This topic is very closely related to the question of recovering a forgotten product on a C^* -algebra, which was discussed e.g. on p. 316 of [4]. The route we take here is that since unitaries have been characterized in Section 2, to characterize C^* -algebras it suffices to 1) characterize when X is the span of the unitaries it contains, and 2) to characterize when the product in $C_e^*(X)$ of every two unitaries u and v in X is again in X . There seem to be many simple characterizations for 1) in the context of unital C^* -algebras, for example that for every u -hermitian element x with $\|x\| \leq 1$, there exists a unitary v in X with $2x - v$ also unitary in X (equivalently, x is the average of two unitaries). The condition 2) also appears to be ‘characterizable’ in many very different ways. For example, X contains the product vu in $C_e^*(X)$ of any two unitaries u, v in X if and only if the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & u \\ v & x \end{bmatrix}$ is $\sqrt{2}$ times a unitary (characterized in Section 2) in $M_2(X)$ for some $x \in X$. Or there is a similar characterization using a 3×3 positivity condition as in [19]. We leave these to the interested reader. The best such condition we have found to date is as follows:

Theorem 3.5. *A unital operator space $(X, 1)$ (characterized above) is isomorphic to a C^* -algebra via a unital complete isometry, if and only if 1) for every 1-hermitian element x with $\|x\| = 1$, there exists a unitary v in X with $2x - v$ also unitary in X , and 2) for any unitary $v \in X$ and any $y \in \text{Ball}(X)$, there exists an element $z \in \text{Ball}(X)$ with $\left\| \begin{bmatrix} t1 & y \\ z & tv \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq \sqrt{1 + t^2}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. It is also equivalent to the conditions mentioned in Theorem 1.3.*

Proof. For the easy direction we may assume that $(X, 1)$ is a unital C^* -algebra, and then by the C^* -identity the asserted relation holds with $z = -vy^*$, and in fact

in this case the norm of the matrix is exactly $\sqrt{t^2 + \|y\|^2}$. For the converse(s), suppose that $1 = I_H \in X \subset B(H)$. If the condition involving the infimum holds, then taking $v = 1$ we see by Theorem 1.2 that X is selfadjoint (that is, is an operator system). Also, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a $z_n \in X$ with $\left\| \begin{bmatrix} nI & y \\ z_n & nv \end{bmatrix} \right\|^2 \leq n^2 + 1 + \frac{1}{n}$. Proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 1.2 we deduce that $\|z_n + vy^*\| \leq 1/n + 1/n^2$, and so $vy^* \in X$. That is, $vX = vX^* \subset X$. Since the unitaries in X are spanning, X is a C^* -subalgebra of $B(H)$. $\square$

Remark. The last theorem and its proof are still valid if we replace “ $y \in \text{Ball}(X)$ ” with y in the set of unitaries in X .

The next result gives a linear-metric ‘method’ to retrieve a forgotten product of any two elements, one of which is an isometry or coisometry.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose that $I_H \in X \subset B(H)$, and that v is a coisometry (resp. isometry) on H which lies in X . If $y, z \in \text{Ball}(X)$ then $z = -vy^*$ (resp. $y = -z^*v$) in $B(H)$ if and only if $\left\| \begin{bmatrix} t1 & y \\ z & tv \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq \sqrt{1+t^2}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. This is similar to the proof of Theorem 3.5. If a is the matrix in the lemma, then by applying states on $M_2(B(H))$ to a^*a or aa^* we obtain as in that proof that $\|z + vy^*\| = 0$ (resp. $\|y + z^*v\| = 0$). $\square$

We note that Theorem 3.5 together with Sakai’s theorem immediately gives a linear-metric characterization of W^* -algebras. We mention an interesting related open question concerning ‘dual operator systems’. We recall that an operator space X is a *dual operator space* if it is the operator space dual of another operator space; and it is a fact that this is essentially the same as saying that X is a weak* closed subspace of some $B(H)$. For this, and for other aspects of the duality of operator spaces we refer the reader to e.g. [6, Section 1.4]. As far as we know, the analogous fact for operator systems, or for unital operator spaces, is open: for example whether an operator system which is also a dual operator space is isomorphic (in the obvious sense) to a weak* closed operator system in $B(H)$, for some Hilbert space H . We can offer the following ‘first step’ in this direction.

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose that (X, u) is a unital operator space and suppose also that X is also a dual Banach space. Then Δ^u and Δ_{sa}^u are weak* closed, and the involution on Δ^u is weak* continuous.*

Proof. Suppose that (x_s) is a net in $\Delta_{\text{sa}}^u \cap \text{Ball}(X)$, with $x_s \rightarrow x$ weak* in X . Then $\|u + ix_s\| \leq \sqrt{1+t^2}$. Taking a limit with s we see that $x \in \Delta_{\text{sa}}^u$. Thus by the Krein-Smulian theorem, Δ_{sa}^u is weak* closed. Next suppose that $(x_s + iy_s)$ is a bounded net in Δ^u , with limit z . Here $x_s, y_s \in \Delta_{\text{sa}}^u$. Then (x_s) and (y_s) are bounded nets. Suppose that a subnet (x_{s_λ}) converges weak* to x say. Then (y_{s_λ}) has a subnet converging weak* to y say. Replacing the nets by subnets, it is easy to see now that $z = x + iy \in \Delta^u$. So Δ^u is weak* closed. Finally, suppose that $x_s + iy_s \rightarrow x + iy$ for $x, y \in \Delta_{\text{sa}}^u$. The argument above shows that every weak* convergent subnet of (x_s) converges to x . Thus $x_s \rightarrow x$ weak*. Similarly, $y_s \rightarrow y$ weak*, and so $(x_s + iy_s)^* = x_s - iy_s \rightarrow x - iy$. By a variant of the Krein-Smulian theorem, the involution is weak* continuous. $\square$

Corollary 3.8. *If X is an operator system which is also a dual Banach space, then the involution on X is weak* continuous.*

It is easy to see that if X is a dual operator space possessing a weak* continuous conjugate linear involution $*$ for which $\|[x_{ji}^*]\|_n = \|[x_{ij}]\|$ for all matrices $[x_{ij}]$ with entries in X , then there exists a weak* homeomorphic $*$ -linear complete isometry from X onto a weak* closed selfadjoint subspace W of some $B(H)$. Indeed if $\varphi : X \rightarrow B(H)$ is any weak* continuous complete isometry then the function $x \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \varphi(x) \\ \varphi(x^*)^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ does the trick. This immediately gives an abstract characterization of weak* closed selfadjoint subspaces of $B(H)$. By the last corollary, any operator system which is also a dual operator space is at least one of the latter. However we are unable to go further at this point.

4. MORE ON OPERATOR SYSTEMS

The following facts will be useful to us below. Given a unital operator space (X, u) , another way to recapture the involution which is sometimes useful is as ux^*u , the latter product and involution taken in a ternary envelope $\mathcal{T}(X)$. It is easy to see that (X, u) is an operator system iff $uX^*u \subset X$ within $\mathcal{T}(X)$, and in this case the expression ux^*u is independent of the particular ternary envelope of X chosen. Also, we leave it to the reader to check that the set of positive elements Δ_+^u in a unital operator space (X, u) is precisely $\mathfrak{d}_u \cap X$, in the notation of [7]. This is a very useful alternative description of the positive elements in X .

Example 4.1. If u is any unitary in a C^* -algebra or TRO A , then (A, u) is an operator system. This follows by the facts presented above Example 4.1, since in this case $uA^*u \subset A$. Moreover, any two unitaries $u, v \in A$ induce in some sense the same operator system structure, since the map $T(x) = vu^*x$ on A is a surjective complete isometry taking u to v ; and hence T is a complete order isomorphism too, by e.g. 1.3.3 in [6].

The features in the last example fail badly for more general operator spaces. It is easy to find operator spaces X with unitaries u, v for which (X, u) is not an operator system but (X, v) is; or for which they are both operator systems but there exists no surjective complete isometry taking u to v . Moreover, the latter can be done with u and v inducing the same involution on X . We mention now explicit examples of these phenomena.

Example 4.2. Let X be the span of $1, f = e^{i\theta}$, and $\bar{f}$, in the continuous functions on the unit circle. Then $(X, 1)$ is an operator system, but (X, f) is not. The latter is easily seen since the circle is the Shilov boundary, so that $C_e^*(X)$ is the space of continuous functions on the circle, and this is a ternary envelope. However $fX^*f \neq X$, and so (X, f) is not an operator system by the facts presented above Example 4.1.

Example 4.3. We describe a selfadjoint space X of continuous functions on a compact topological space K (equal to the Shilov boundary of X), with X containing constant functions, and a unimodular continuous g on K , such that (X, g) is an operator system with unchanged involution, but there exists no surjective isometric isomorphism $T : X \rightarrow X$ with $T(1) = g$.

Let K be the topological disjoint union of two copies of the circle of unit radius centered at $(1, 0)$, and let g be 1 on the first circle and -1 on the other. Let $f(z) = z$ for any z in either circle. Let $X = \text{Span}(\{1, g, f, \bar{f}\})$. Then the reader can check, using Proposition 4.4 and Corollary 4.6 below, and the fact that a $*$ -isomorphism of $C(K)$ is ‘composition with a homeomorphism’ $\tau : K \rightarrow K$, that X has all the properties described in the last paragraph.

Proposition 4.4. *Let X be a unital operator space viewed within its C^* -envelope $A = C_e^*(X)$. Suppose that v is a unitary in X . Then there exists a surjective complete isometry $T : X \rightarrow X$ with $T(1) = v$ if and only if there is a $*$ -isomorphism $\theta : A \rightarrow A$ such that $v^*X = \theta(X)$.*

Proof. For the one direction simply set $T = v\theta(\cdot)$. Conversely, suppose that $T : X \rightarrow X$ is as stated. Since the C^* -envelope is a ternary envelope, by universal properties of the ternary envelope we may extend T to a surjective complete isometry $\tilde{T} : C_e^*(X) \rightarrow C_e^*(X)$. Then $\tilde{T}$ is a ternary morphism by [6, Corollary 4.4.6], and $\theta = v^*\tilde{T}(\cdot)$ is easily seen to be a $*$ -isomorphism of A onto itself. The rest is obvious. $\square$

Remark. Lemma 3.6 supplies a ‘linear-metric’ sufficient condition for the existence of a complete isometry T with $T(u) = v$ as in the last result. Namely, suppose that (X, u) is an operator system, and that v is another unitary in X . Without loss of generality we may take $X = X^* \subset A = C_e^*(X)$ with $1_A = u$. With respect to the structure in A , Lemma 3.6 shows that $vX^* \subset X$ if and only if any $y \in \text{Ball}(X)$, there exists an element $z \in \text{Ball}(X)$ with $\left\| \begin{bmatrix} t1 & y \\ z & tv \end{bmatrix} \right\| \leq \sqrt{t^2 + 1}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. By symmetry, $X^*v \subset X$ iff a similar condition to that in the last line holds, but with the 1-2 and the 2-1 entries switched in the matrix. It is easy to see that both of the conditions in the last two sentences hold simultaneously iff $vX^* = X$, that is, iff $vX = X$. In turn, if the latter holds, then clearly the map $T(x) = vu^*x$ is a complete isometry from X onto X with $T(u) = v$. Of course the latter forces (X, v) to be an operator system (and T to be ‘ $*$ -linear’).

Proposition 4.5. *If X is an operator space with unitaries u and v such that (X, u) and (X, v) are operator systems, then the involutions on these two systems are the same if and only if u^*v is in the center of Z^*Z and equals v^*u ; where $Z = T(X)$.*

Proof. To say that the involutions are the same is to say that $ux^*u = vx^*v$ for all $x \in X$. Setting $x = u$ gives $u = vu^*v$, so that $v^*u = u^*v$. Moreover, it is simple algebra to check that $x^*yu^*v = u^*vx^*y$ for $x, y \in X$. Since spans of products of terms of the form x^*y for $x, y \in X$ are dense in Z^*Z , we deduce that u^*v is in the center of Z^*Z .

Conversely, suppose that $u^*v = v^*u$ is in the center of Z^*Z . Then for all $x \in Z$, we have $ux^*u = vv^*ux^*u = vx^*uv^*u = vx^*uu^*v = vx^*v$. $\square$

Corollary 4.6. *Let v be a unitary in an operator subsystem $X \subset B(H)$. Then $v \in X_{\text{sa}}$ and v is in the center of $C_e^*(X)$, if and only if (X, v) is an operator system, and the involution associated with v equals the original involution.*

Proof. The one direction follows immediately from Proposition 4.5. For the other, if $v = v^*$ and v is in the center of $C_e^*(X)$, then clearly (X, v) is an operator system, and it has unchanged involution. $\square$

Remark. Of course saying that the involutions associated with two unitaries u and v coincide, is equivalent to saying that every u -hermitian is v -hermitian. This is assuming that (X, u) is an operator system.

In the remainder of the section, we mention a connection to the famous characterization due to Choi and Effros of operator systems [10] in terms of a given cone in the space. We will assume throughout that we have a fixed cone $\mathfrak{c}$ in X , and that this cone spans X (although this also often follows as a consequence of some of the conditions imposed below). We allow two variants of the theory: depending on whether or not we are assuming the existence of a given fixed involution $*$ on X . If the latter holds, we will assume further that $x = x^*$ for all $x \in \mathfrak{c}$.

Definition 4.7. By an *ordered operator space* below we will mean a pair $(X, \mathfrak{c})$ consisting of an operator space and a cone $\mathfrak{c}$ in X , such that there exists a complete isometry of X into a C^* -algebra A taking $\mathfrak{c}$ into A_+ .

Proposition 4.8. *Suppose that $(X, \mathfrak{c})$ is an ordered operator space, and that u is a unitary in X contained in $\mathfrak{c}$. If $\mathfrak{c}$ spans X then (X, u) is an operator system. Moreover, in the ‘involutive variant’ of the theory (mentioned above Definition 4.7), the involution induced by u equals the original involution $*$.*

Proof. We use notation and facts from [7]. Consider the ordered ternary envelope of X , whose positive cone is a natural cone $\mathfrak{d}_v$ given by an open tripotent v . Also, $\mathfrak{c} \subset \mathfrak{d}_v$. Since $u \in \mathfrak{c} \subset \mathfrak{d}_v$, and u is unitary, it follows that $u = v$. Thus $\mathfrak{c} \subset \mathfrak{d}_u \cap X = \Delta_+^u$. Since $\mathfrak{c}$ is spanning, this implies by Corollary 3.3 that (X, u) is an operator system. In the ‘involutive variant’, notice that $ux^*u = x = x^*$ for $x \in \mathfrak{c}$, and hence for $x \in X$ since $\mathfrak{c}$ is spanning. This also shows that u is central in the sense of [9] in the ordered ternary envelope of X . $\square$

Next, we seek conditions which imply that (X, u) is an operator system whose cone is precisely $\mathfrak{c}$. If we also had cones in $M_n(X)$, then necessary and sufficient conditions for this may be found in the famous characterization due to Choi and Effros of operator systems [10, 16]. The most prominent of these conditions is the existence of a ‘matricial order unit’. We show here that the following weaker condition suffices:

Definition 4.9. We say that u is a *norm-order unit* for $\mathfrak{c}$ if $u \in \mathfrak{c}$ and for every $x \in X_{\text{sa}}$ we have $\|x\|u - x \in \mathfrak{c}$.

In the ‘non-involutive space variant’ of the theory (see the discussion above Definition 4.7), we replace X_{sa} here by the u -hermitians on X .

Proposition 4.10. *Suppose that $(X, \mathfrak{c})$ is an ordered operator space, and that u is a unitary in X which is a norm-order unit for $\mathfrak{c}$. Then (X, u) is an operator system whose positive cone Δ_+^u is $\mathfrak{c}$.*

Proof. We saw in Proposition 4.8 that (X, u) is an operator system, $\mathfrak{c} \subset \mathfrak{d}_u$, and that in the ‘involutive space variant’ of the theory the involution is unambiguous. If $x \in \mathfrak{d}_u \cap X = \Delta_+^u$ then x is u -positive. If $t = \|x\|$, then $tu - x \in \mathfrak{c}$. Hence $tu - x = c$ for some $c \in \mathfrak{c}$. Viewed within the C^* -algebra $Z_2''(u)$ (notation as in [7]), we have $\|c\| = \|tu - x\| \leq t$, since $tu - x \leq tu$ in $Z_2''(u)$. Thus $x = tu - c = (t - \|c\|)u + (\|c\|u - c) \in \mathfrak{c}$. So $\Delta_+^u = \mathfrak{c}$. $\square$

Corollary 4.11. *Suppose that (X, u) is an operator system and that $\mathfrak{c}$ is a subcone of Δ_+^u , such that u is a norm-order unit for $\mathfrak{c}$. Then $\Delta_+^u = \mathfrak{c}$.*

Proof. Clearly $(X, \mathfrak{c})$ is an ordered operator space, and we are in the situation of Proposition 4.10. $\square$

Remark. In the previous context, the range tripotent of an order unit can be shown to be unitary. Hence an order unit which is a partial isometry is unitary.

5. FUNCTION SPACES

By a *function space* we will mean a closed subspace of a commutative C^* -algebra. Abstractly, these are just the Banach spaces, or equivalently the operator spaces which have the ‘Min’ structure (eg. see 1.2.21 in [6]). By a *selfadjoint function space* we will mean a closed selfadjoint subspace of a commutative C^* -algebra. By a *unitary in X* , where X is a Banach space, we will mean an element $g \in X$ such that there exists a linear isometry $T : X \rightarrow C(K)$, for a compact Hausdorff space K , with $T(g) = 1$. We shall show below that there is no conflict with the earlier definition of a unitary in X . There is however a conflict with the notation in [3]. Indeed, if K is the Shilov boundary of a unital function space X , then unitaries in X in our sense are just the elements in X which are unimodular on K . A *unital function space* is a pair (X, g) where g is a unitary in the Banach space X . By replacing $C(K)$ by the C^* -algebra generated by $T(X)$ we may assume that $T(X)$ separates points of K , a common assumption in the function theory literature. Indeed, unital function spaces may be taken as the ‘basic setting’ for the presentation of what some might call the ‘classical Shilov boundary’, as is explained in Section 4.1 of [6]. Although it is not very difficult, we are not aware of any abstract characterization of unital function spaces in the literature until now.

Theorem 5.1. *Let g be an element in a Banach space X . The following are equivalent:*

- (i) *g is a unitary in X in the sense above.*
- (ii) *g is a unitary in $\text{Min}(X)$ in the sense of the introduction of our paper.*
- (iii) *$\sup\{\|sf + tg\| : s, t \in \mathbb{C}, |s|^2 + |t|^2 = 1\} = \sqrt{2}$ for every $f \in X$ with $\|f\| = 1$.*

Thus (X, g) is a unital function space if and only if (iii) holds.

Proof. (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) This follows because every isometry between minimal operator spaces is a complete isometry (see e.g. 1.2.21 in [6]).

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) By 4.2.11 in [6] the injective envelope, and hence the ternary envelope Z , of $\text{Min}(X)$, is a minimal operator space. Hence Z^*Z is commutative by [6, Proposition 8.6.5]. Since gX is unitary in Z by Lemma 2.2 (iii), the map $x \mapsto g^*x$ is a ‘unital isometry’ from X into the commutative C^* -algebra Z^*Z .

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) One may prove that (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) using classical techniques, but instead we will deduce it from our noncommutative results. It is well known (and an easy exercise), that the norm of $[f \ g]$, as a row with entries in $\text{Min}(X)$, is $\sup\{\|sf + tg\| : s, t \in \mathbb{C}, |s|^2 + |t|^2 = 1\}$, and a similar statement holds for columns. Following the proof of Theorem 2.3 we see that the operator L there is an isometry. Hence it is a complete isometry by facts mentioned in the last two paragraphs, and as in the other proof this implies $uu^* = 1$ in Z^*Z . Similarly, $u^*u = 1$. That is, u is a unitary in Z , and we can apply Lemma 2.2.

That (i) implies (iii) is left as an exercise. $\square$

By a *function system* we will mean a closed selfadjoint subspace of $C(K)$, for compact K , containing constant functions. There is an obvious ‘abstract definition’: (X, g) is a function system if there exists an isometry $T : X \rightarrow C(K)$ with $T(g) = 1$ and $T(X)$ selfadjoint. It is easy to see that this is equivalent to saying that $(\text{Min}(X), g)$ is an operator system. See also [17]. Many of the results in earlier sections concerning operator systems have ‘function system’ analogues. For example, function systems are the obviously the unital function spaces (X, g) which are spanned by their g -hermitians. The following is another characterization of function systems, which also improves on Corollary 4.6 in our present situation:

Theorem 5.2. *Let X be a selfadjoint function space (defined above). If v is any unitary in X with $v = v^*$ then (X, v) is a function system and the involution associated with v equals the original involution.*

Proof. Let X be a selfadjoint subspace of $C(K)$, for compact K . The TRO generated by X in $C(K)$ is a $*$ -subTRO of $C(K)$, and it follows that the ‘ternary $*$ -envelope’ Z of X (see [5]) is ‘commutative’: that is $xy = yx$ for all $x, y \in Z$. Also $C = v^*Z$ is a commutative unital C^* -algebra, and $T(x) = v^*x$ is an isometric ‘unital’ map into C . Since X is a selfadjoint subspace of Z it is easy to see that T is ‘ $*$ -linear’, and the rest is obvious. Alternatively, note that $vx^*v = x^*vv^* = x^*$ for $x \in X$. $\square$

The class of selfadjoint function spaces (not necessarily with a unit), which appear in the last result, may be characterized abstractly, although again we have not seen this in the literature. For example, we have the following characterization in terms of ‘selfadjoint functionals’, by which we mean that $\varphi(x^*) = \overline{\varphi(x)}$ for $x \in X$. We remark that this result unfortunately violates our principle of not using maps or functionals on the space; perhaps a better characterization will be forthcoming.

Proposition 5.3. *Selfadjoint function spaces are precisely the Banach spaces X with an involution $*$ having the property that every extreme point of $\text{Ball}(X^*)$ is a scalar multiple of a selfadjoint functional.*

Proof. Any X with the announced property is clearly $*$ -linearly isometric to a selfadjoint subspace of the continuous functions on the weak* compact set of selfadjoint elements in $\text{Ball}(X^*)$. For the converse, we may suppose that we have a selfadjoint subspace $X \subset C(K)$, with K compact (by replacing the commutative C^* -algebra with its unitization). By the routine Krein-Milman type argument, any extreme point for $\text{Ball}(X^*)$ is the restriction of an extreme point for $\text{Ball}(C(K)^*)$. Hence it is of the form $\chi\delta_w$, where $\chi \in \mathbb{C}$ and δ_w is point evaluation at $w \in K$. It is clear that δ_w is selfadjoint. $\square$

Closing remark. Having an abstract characterization of a class of objects is often useful in order to show that the class is closed under the usual shopping list of ‘constructions’, such as direct sums, certain quotients, tensor products, ultraproducts, interpolation, etc. In our case one may certainly do this, but we will not do so here, for the reason that all of these can seemingly be done without appealing to our new characterizations. For example, as C. K. Ng has suggested to us privately, one may prove their result from [13] about quotients by M -ideals using our criteria too. We mention a third way to prove this result: if X is a unital operator space

(resp. operator system) sitting in its C^* -envelope A , then by basic facts about M -summands from e.g. [6, Section 4.8] and references therein, we may view a complete M -projection on X as a projection p in the center of A which is also in X . Thus pX is a unital subspace (resp. operator subsystem) of pAp . This does the M -summand case, and the M -ideal case follows by the idea in [13] of going to the second dual.

Acknowledgement. The last section of the paper was written shortly after the first version of our paper was distributed. We have also added several references (see e.g. the discussion at the end of the introduction).

REFERENCES

- [1] C. A. Akemann and N. Weaver, *Geometric characterizations of some classes of operators in C^* -algebras and von Neumann algebras*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **130** (2002), 3033–3037.
- [2] W. B. Arveson, *Subalgebras of C^* -algebras*, Acta Math. **123** (1969), 141–224.
- [3] P. Bandyopadhyay, K. Jarosz, and T. S. S. R. K. Rao, *Unitaries in Banach spaces*, Illinois J. Math. **48** (2004), 339–351.
- [4] D. P. Blecher, E. G. Effros, and V. Zarikian, *One-sided M -ideals and multipliers in operator spaces, I*, Pacific J. Math. **206** (2002), 287–319.
- [5] D. P. Blecher, K. Kirkpatrick, M. Neal, and W. Werner, *Ordered involutive operator spaces*, Positivity **11** (2007), 497–510.
- [6] D. P. Blecher and C. Le Merdy, *Operator algebras and their modules—an operator space approach*, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford (2004).
- [7] D. P. Blecher and M. Neal, *Open partial isometries and positivity in operator spaces*, Studia Math **182** (2007), 227–262.
- [8] D. P. Blecher, Z. J. Ruan, and A. M. Sinclair, *A characterization of operator algebras*, J. Functional Anal. **89** (1990), 188–201.
- [9] D. P. Blecher and W. Werner, *Ordered C^* -modules*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **92** (2006), 682–712.
- [10] M.-D. Choi and E. G. Effros, *Injectivity and operator spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. **24** (1977), 156–209.
- [11] C. M. Edwards and G. T. Rüttimann, *On the facial structure of the unit balls in a JBW^* -triple and its predual*, J. London Math. Soc. **38** (1988), 317–332.
- [12] M. Hamana, *Triple envelopes and Silov boundaries of operator spaces*, Math. J. Toyama University **22** (1999), 77–93.
- [13] X. J. Huang and C. K. Ng, *An abstract characterization of unital operator spaces*, Preprint (2008) arXiv:0805.2447
- [14] M. Neal and B. Russo, *Operator space characterizations of C^* -algebras and ternary rings*, Pacific J. Math. **209** (2003), 339–364.
- [15] T. W. Palmer, *Banach algebras and the general theory of $*$ -algebras, Vol. II. $*$ -algebras*, Encyclopedia of Math. and its Appl., 79, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- [16] V. I. Paulsen, *Completely bounded maps and operator algebras*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Math., 78, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
- [17] V. I. Paulsen and M. Tomforde, *Vector spaces with an order unit*, Preprint (2007), arXiv:0712.2613
- [18] Z.-J. Ruan, *Subspaces of C^* -algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **76** (1988), 217–230.
- [19] M. E. Walter, *Algebraic structures determined by 3 by 3 matrix geometry*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **131** (2003), 2129–2131.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON, HOUSTON, TX 77204-3008
E-mail address, David P. Blecher: dblecher@math.uh.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, DENISON UNIVERSITY, GRANVILLE, OH 43023
E-mail address: nealm@denison.edu